

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-22, and 24-26 are currently pending in the present application. In the Office Action. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-22, and 24-26, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,745,253 (Struble).

The present application, as defined by the Claims, is drawn to an apparatus and method for controlling ad-hoc network connections of a wireless communication device with peripheral devices while lowering power consumption and enhancing a user's convenience. Unlike prior art devices, which constantly scan for available peripherals (and waste valuable system resources doing so), the inventive method, as defined by the Claims of the present application, determines when it is likely that the user will want to use a peripheral device for a specific function upon the occurrence of an event and searches for peripheral devices based on the determination. For example, when a mobile telephone receives an SMS message, the user may want to print it, so the mobile phone looks for, and connects to, a printer in anticipation of the user's possible need to print. Furthermore, according to the present application, as defined by the Claims, a digital camera will find and connect to a printer upon taking a picture, in anticipation of the user wanting to print the picture. Thus, according to the present application, power consumption and the time necessary to initiate a network connection is reduced. Thus,

enhancing a user's operating convenience.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) of independent Claim 1, the Examiner states that Struble teaches each and every limitation of Claim 1. More specifically, the Examiner states that Struble teaches the recitation of wherein the search means searches for a peripheral device when the detection means detects that the peripheral device is likely to be utilized by the wireless communication device before a user request, as recited in Claim 1. After reviewing Struble, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect.

Struble discloses a system and method with which a user can locate and determine the functional capabilities of the peripheral devices so that the person can determine whether or not to use the peripheral devices (e.g., see, Column 1, Lines 43-46). This is similar to the method which is disclosed in the background section of the disclosure of the present invention (e.g., see, the Paragraph beginning at Line 21, of Page 2 of the present application). Regarding the operational flow of Struble, with reference to FIGs. 3A and 3B, Struble teaches a user's preferences are received, a transmission to peripheral devices is initiated and thereafter the capability of the peripheral devices are displayed and the user's data transmission command is awaited for and received (e.g., see, Steps 302, 308, 316, 318, and 320, respectively, and similar steps in FIGs. 5 and 6). In other words, Struble merely teaches matching device capabilities with user preferences.

However, Struble does not mention when the flowcharts shown in FIGs. 3 and 5-6 are begun nor does Struble disclose flags and commands corresponding to a set flag.

In contrast, Claim 1 includes the recitations of wherein the search means searches for a peripheral device when the detection means detects that the peripheral device is likely to be utilized by the wireless communication device before a user request, setting a flag according to the availability of the peripheral device, and awaiting a user's selection of a command corresponding to a set flag, as recited in Claim 1.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) of independent Claim 6, this Claim includes similar recitations as those contained in Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 6 is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to Claim 1.

Claims 3-5, 8-22 and 24-26 are dependent claims; accordingly, if the above arguments place the independent claims into condition for allowance, then these dependent claims will also be in condition for allowance.

Independent Claims 1 and 6 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 3-5, 8-22 and 24-26, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of

the rejections of dependent Claims 3-5, 8-22 and 24-26 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1, 3-6, 8-22 and 24-26, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/VAG/ml